

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-identified application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-24 remain pending, wherein claim 1 is amended.

The undersigned would like to thank Examiner Husar for his time and courtesy during the personal interview conducted on February 23, 2005. As discussed during the interview, claim 1 is being amended to recite “a semireflecting mirror screen having a uniformly semireflecting surface.” Support for this amendment can be found in the present application in numbered paragraphs 0011 and 0032, and Fig. 1, which disclose screen 7 having a uniformly semireflecting surface 8.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner’s acknowledgement of Applicants’ claim for foreign priority, and that all of the certified copies of the priority document have been received.

Applicants also appreciate the indication that claims 7-14 and 19-23 contain allowable subject matter. Claims 8-10, 12, 13 and 20-22 variously depend from claim 1, and for the reasons discussed below it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

In the second paragraph of the Office Action claims 1-6, 15-18, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No.

5,373,423 to Leidtke et al ("Leidtke"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Leidtke does not anticipate Applicants' claim 1, because Leidtke does not disclose all of the elements of claim 1. For example, Leidtke does not disclose "a semireflecting mirror screen having a uniformly semireflecting surface, the screen being arranged between the covering pane and the light unit," as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

Leidtke discloses a signal light for a motor vehicle. The signal light includes a screen 28, which is located between a light source and a cover disc 20. Figs. 1-3 of Leidtke illustrate three different embodiments of screen 28.

In the embodiment illustrated in Fig. 1 of Leidtke, the screen "is composed of a plate 30" in which "light permeable regions are formed as passages 32." (Col. 2, lines 57-61). A reflective coating 34 is formed on the face of plate 30, which faces cover disc 20. (Col. 2, lines 65-68). Because a reflective coating is formed on a face of plate 30, which has light permeable regions, the first embodiment of Leidtke does not disclose "a semireflecting mirror screen having a uniformly semireflecting surface", as recited in Applicants' claim 1.

In the embodiment illustrated in Fig. 2 of Leidtke, the "plate 130 of a screen device 28 is composed of a transparent material such as synthetic plastic or glass, and is provided on its side facing the cover disc 20 with a reflecting coating 34 which is interrupted for forming the light permeable regions 132." (Col 3, lines 46-50). Accordingly, in this embodiment of Leidtke, the front face of

plate 130 is not “a semireflecting mirror screen having a uniformly semireflecting surface” as recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

In the embodiment illustrated in Fig. 3 of Leidke, the “plate 230 on its side facing the cover disc 20 is provided with a reflective coating 234 which is interrupted for forming light permeable regions 232.” (Col. 4, lines 2-5).

Accordingly, in this embodiment of Leidtke, the front face of plate 230 is not “a semireflecting mirror screen having a uniformly semireflecting surface”, as recited in Applicants’ claim 1.

Accordingly, as discussed during the interview, all of the embodiments of Leidtke disclose that the reflective coating includes light permeable and light impermeable regions. Therefore, Leidtke does not disclose “a screen arranged between the covering pane and the light unit, wherein the screen comprises a base plate which, on and a front side of the screen facing the covering pane, is uniformly covered by a semireflecting metal coating,” as recited in Applicants’ claim 1. Accordingly, Leidtke does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2-6, 15-18, and 24 variously depend from Applicant’s claim 1, and hence, are not anticipated by Leidtke for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Applicant’s claim 1.

All outstanding objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in immediate condition for allowance. Notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 080437.51664US).

Respectfully submitted,

March 1, 2005



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
#358661v1